

A party may serve and file specific, written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations of the magistrate judge within 14 days after being served with a copy of the Report and Recommendation, and thereby secure a *de novo* review by the district court. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b); FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b). A party's failure to timely file written objections to the proposed findings, conclusion, and recommendations in a Report and Recommendation bars that party, except upon grounds of plain error, from attacking on appeal the unobjected-to proposed factual findings and legal conclusions accepted by the district court. *See Douglass v. United*

States Auto Ass'n, 79 F.3d 1415 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc).

Vurimindi filed objections to the Report and Recommendation on April 5, 2023 (Doc. #10). Vurimindi submitted supplemental materials to the objections on April 7, 2023 (Doc. #11). In light of the objections, the court has undertaken a *de novo* review of the entire case file and finds that the magistrate judge's report and recommendation should be approved and accepted by the court for substantially the reasons stated therein.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiff Vamsidhar Vurimindi's objections to the Report and Recommendation (Doc. #10) are **OVERRULED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the United States Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (Doc. #6) filed in this cause is **APPROVED** and **ACCEPTED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff Vamsidhar Vurimindi's lawsuit is **DISMISSED** as frivolous under Section 1915(e).

The court will render final judgment by separate order.

SIGNED this 18th day of April, 2023.



LEE YEAKEL
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE